


C-8353 SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS CASES 004 EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL. U. 1988-89 WILLIAM, ET AL. (3RD DISTRICT)


C-8353 SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS CASES EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL. V. KIRBY,


004 1988-89















GENERAL HIGHWAY MAP EL PASO COUNTY TEXAS

STATE OF PARTIEUT OF INCOMENS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION THE STATE OF TRANSPORTATION OF SEPARTICUT OF TRANSPORTATION (1900) INCOMENSATION (1900)


TERMS EDUCATION AGENCY DISTINCT EQUAL PRICE BY COUNTY


COLUMNY COLUMN	(7 mans		CALL OF THE PARTY	TOTAL NO OF TOURNS WALES
STIES CLAST COLOR STIES COLOR		20 20 20 20 21 21 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	•	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1



Fisher -Nolan Counties

District does not offer all 12 grades







C-8353 SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS CASES 004 EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL. U. 1988-89 WILLIAM, ET AL. (3RD DISTRICT)


C-8353
SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS CASES
EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL. V. KIRBY,
WILLIAM, ET AL. (3RD DISTRICT)


004 1988-89















GENERAL HIGHWAY MAP EL PASO COUNTY TEXAS

STATE OF PARTIEUT OF INCOMENS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION THE STATE OF TRANSPORTATION OF SEPARTICUT OF TRANSPORTATION (1900) INCOMENSATION (1900)


TERMS EDUCATION AGENCY DISTINCT EQUAL PRICE BY COUNTY


COLUMNY COLUMN	(7 mans		CALL OF THE PARTY	TOTAL NO OF TOURNS WALES
STIES CLAST COLOR STIES COLOR		20 20 20 20 21 21 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	•	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1





Fisher -Nolan Counties


District does not offer all 12 grades

























Hockley - Cochran Counties
















UNIVERAL HISPANAY MAP ***** District does not offer all 12 grades KLEBERG COUNTY TEXAS Kingsville ISD 5278 students 0.80 tax rate \$3203 expend \$142,988 wealth Loureless ISD 44 students 0.13 tax rate \$13,223 expend \$10,006,630 wealth Ricardo ISD 373 students 1.32 tax rate \$3488 expend \$144,810 wealth RIVIERA ISD GERTRUDIS Riviera ISD Santa Gertrudis ISD students 1.17 students 78 \$6110 expend 0.08 tax rate \$482,104 wealth \$12,840 expend \$13,276,273 wealth **** LAURELES ISD -29-














































+++++ District does not offer all 12 grades




GENERAL HIGHWAY MAP WALLER COUNTY

STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY DISTRICT SQUARE MILES, BY COUNTY



COUNTY DISTRICT NO.	DISTRICT NAME		MATTER IN MATTER MATTER MO OL 20	COUNTER IN	1
237 237902 237904 237904	WALLER COUNTY HEMPSTEAD ISD WALLER ISD ROYAL ISD		1.39 805 157	116 0	
101914	RATY ED COUNTY TOTAL	•	19	180	



Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund

The Commerce Building, LTD 314 East Commerce Street Suite 200 San Antonio, TX 78205 (512) 224-5476



FILED IN SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

February 6, 1989

FEB 10 1989 U 8358

Hon. Susan K. Bage, Clerk
Court of Appeals
Third Supreme Judicial District
P. O. Box 12547
Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711

Re: No. 3-87-190-CV--William Kirby et al., v. Edgewood Independent School District, et al.,

Dear Ms. Bage:

Enclosed are additional pages which belong at the end of Petitioners/Plaintiffs' Appendix. In his haste to complete our order, the printer failed to include the last pages among the copies in the Appendix that we sent to the Court on Friday. We apologize sincerely for the oversight.

The copies which were sent to counsel of record in this appeal were all correctly copied. As far as I know, only the copies that were sent to the Clerk lacked the final pages of the Appendix.

I am enclosing 12 copies of the missing pages, which I am asking that you file with the Appendix that you received last Friday. I send only the missing pages in order to minimize the amount of paper filed with the Clerk. However, if you require that a new and complete copy be filed, please let me know.

Again, we are sorry that these pages were left out.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

ALBERT H. KAŬFFMAN

Staff Attorney

FEB 0 7 89

AHK:mg

5. The stated constitutional purpose, contained in Article VII, Section 1, is: "A general diffusion of knowledge being essential to the preservation of the liberties and rights of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature of the State to establish and make suitable provision for the support and maintenance of an efficient system of public free schools."

The question becomes, does the random and often chaotic allocation of wealth among school districts and the resulting discrimination against students in the provision of education rationally serve the stated purposes of Article VII, Section 1? Is this funding scheme rationally related to the "support and maintenance of an efficient system" of public education or to accomplish the "general diffusion of knowledge."

- 6. Section 16.001 of the Texas Education Code expresses the State policy to be that "provision of public education is a State responsibility and that a thorough and efficient system be provided and substantially financed through State revenue sources so that each student enrolled in the public school system shall have access to programs and services that are appropriate to his or her educational needs and that are substantially equal to those available to any similar student, notwithstanding varying local economic factors." The question becomes, does the random and often choatic allocation of wealth among school districts and the resulting discrimination against students in the provision of education rationally serve the stated purposes of Section 16.001?
- 7. "School districts are but subdivisions of the state government, organized for convenience in exercising the govern-

mental function of establishing and maintaining public free schools for the benefit of the people." Lee v. Leonard I.S.D., 24 S.W. 2d 449 (Tex. Civ. App. -- Texarkana 1930, error ref'd). And "the Legislature has authority to enlarge or consolidate school districts in such a manner as it deems fit." North Common School District v. Live Oak County Board, 199 S.W. 3d 764 (Tex. 1946).

- 8. The Texas Supreme Court in applying Article 1, Section 3 of the Texas Constitution does not consider itself bound by decisions of the United States Supreme Court under the Fourteenth Amendment and the Texas courts are "free to accept or reject federal holdings" in formulating a body of law under the State's own Constitution. Whitworth v. Bynum, 699 S.W. 2d at 196.
- 9. The Court must consider whether a statute is overbroad, over-inclusive or harsh when considering its constitutionality under the rational basis standard. Sullivan v. University Scholastic League, 616 S.W. 2d 170 (Tex. 1981); Whitworth v. Bynum, 699 S.W. 2d 194 (Tex. 1985)
- 10. In <u>Plyler v. Doe</u>, 457 U.S. 202 (1982), the Supreme Court struck down Sec. 21.031 of the Texas Education Code which effectively barred undocumented children from Texas schools. While noting that education was not a fundamental interest under the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court held that a confluence of factors, including the implication of educational interest, compelled the state to show it had a "substantial" interest in its scheme. <u>Id</u>. at 231. Among the factors weighed in raising the level of justification of the state was the existence of

innocent children who were burdened, as well as a nexus between those children and traditionally suspect classes, alienage and race.

B. The Defendants' Obligations

The State must demonstrate that its system of school finance is rationally related to a legitimate state purpose.

C. Facts Demonstrating That the Texas System of Funding Public Education Does Have an Adverse Impact and Impinges Upon the Educational Opportunities Afforded Children

The Court has listed its findings on this issues in Section

II, supra.

D. Findings of Fact Demonstrating that the Existing

System of Funding Public Education is Not

Rationally Related to the Purposes Expressed

By Article 7, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution

and/or Section 16.001 of the Texas Education Code

The Court has listed its findings on this issue in Section II, supra and Section IV infra.

Facts Demonstrating That the Adverse Impact

Found to Exist as a Result of the State

System of Public School Finance is not

Justified by Local Control or Preservation

of Community of Interest

The Court has listed its findings on this issue in Section II, supra and Section IV, infra.

F. Legal Conclusion

The system of public school finance in Texas creates and enforces classifications which have an adverse impact on

plaintiffs. The system is not rationally related to legitimate state purposes and violates Article I §§3 and 3(a) of the Texas Constitution.

THE TEXAS SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM 1S NOT AN EFFICIENT SYSTEM

Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors further contend that the Texas system for funding public education violates Article VII, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution.

A. Legal Standards

1. The Texas Constitution provides in Article VII, Section 1:

A general diffusion of knowledge being essential to the preservation of the liberties and rights of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature of the State to establish and make suitable provision for the support and maintenance of an efficient system of public free schools.

- 2. The word efficient as defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary means "productive without waste."
- 3. The Oxford American Directory defines efficient as "acting effectively; producing results with little waste of effort."
- 4. The West Virginia Supreme Court has defined a thorough and efficient education as one that:

develops, as best the state of education expertise allows, the minds, bodies, and social morality of its charges to prepare them for useful and happy occupation, recreation and citizenship, and does so economically.

Legal recognized elements in this definition are development in every child to his or her capacity of (1) literacy: (2) ability to add, subtract, multiply and divide numbers; (3) knowledge of government to the extent that the child will be equipped as a citizen to make informed choices among persons and issues that affect his own governance; (4) self-knowledge and knowledge of his or her total environment to allow the child to intelligently choose life work -- to know his options; (5) work-training and her advanced academic training as the child may intelligently choose; (6) recreational pursuits; (7) interests in all creative arts, such as music, theatre, literature, and the visual arts: (8) social ethics. behavioral and abstract, to facilitate compatibility with others in this society.

Implicit are supportive services: (1) good physical facilities, instructional materials and personnel; (2) careful state and local supervision to prevent waste and to monitor pupil, teacher and administrative competency.

Pauley v. Kelly, 255 S.E. 2d 859 (W.Va. 1979).

5. The West Virginia Education Article, W.VA. CONST. Art. XII \$1 states:

The legislature shall provide, by general law, for a thorough and efficient system of free schools.

Based on this Article, the West Virginia Supreme Court held:

the Thorough and Efficient Clause requires the development of certain high quality educational standards, and it is in part by these quality standards that the existing educational system must be tested.

Pauley v. Kelly, 225 S.E. 2d 859, 878 (W.Va. 1979).

6. Based upon their respective "thorough and efficient" clauses, the Supreme Courts of Arkansas, <u>Dupree v. Alma School</u>

District No. 30, 651 S.W. 2d 90 (1983); New Jersey, Robinson v. Cahill, 303 A.2d 272 (N.J. 1973); and Wyoming, Washokie County School District No. 1 v. Herschler, 606 P.2d 310 (Wyoming 1980) found their respective school finance systems unconstitutional.

B. The State's Requirement in View of the Law

Article VII, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution requires the State to maintain a cost-efficient/non-wasteful system of public free schools.

C. Facts Demonstrating That the Texas School Finance System Does Not Meet Its Obligations Under TEX. CONST. Art. 7, §1

The Court has made its findings on this issue in Section II, supra and in addition finds as follows:

- 1. The school district configurations in Texas, harboring as they do vast disparities in wealth among the districts, are neither efficient nor equitable and result in significantly different educational opportunities for children and widely varying tax burdens for taxpayers. (Hooker, Walker, Foster)
- 2. There is no underlying rationale in the district boundaries of many school districts in Texas and there are many districts that are pure tax havens. (Hooker, Walker, Foster, Moak)
- 3. There are tax haven districts with very few students that shelter substantial property wealth that could and should be used as a tax base to support public education. (Foster, Walker, PX 1)

- 4. The system is not financially efficient. (Foster, Hooker)
- 5. If district organizational lines were reorganized the financial efficiency of the system could be greatly increased. (Moak, Hooker)
- 6. Those individuals of political influence who could impact the political process by and large reside in districts of above average wealth. (Ward, Hooker, Foster)
- 7. The advantage of wealth and influence are enjoyed by the wealthy districts while the poor districts must survive with greatly limited resources and little or no means to improve their situation. (Ward, Boyd, Sawyer, Sybert, Hooker)
- 8. There are school districts operating within the State of Texas with full accreditation privileges and recognized by the Texas Education Agency and the State of Texas for all purposes with as few as four students. (Bergin)
- 9. State monies are channeled to "tax haven districts" either via the current funding formula or though the manner in which the State chooses to disburse monies from the Available School Fund. (Mooker, Foster, Collins, Moak)
- 10. The State of Texas has allowed many small districts to exist which because of diseconomies of scale are inefficient. Many of these small districts are also property poor. (Kirby, Hooker, Moak, PX 239)
- 11. Regardless of size some districts are inefficient because of lack of wealth which prevents them from providing a fully adequate educational program. (Hooker, Boyd, PX 239)

- 12. The existing funding system creates "budget balanced districts" whose total property wealth is not available for the funding of public education; at average tax rates this loss to public education exceeds \$200,000,000 annually. (Foster, PX 110)
- 13. Geographic anomalies exist in the pattern of district lines that result in unnecessary transportation costs and other inefficiencies; the Governor's committee, appointed by Governor Connally, in 1965, recommended that for purposes of efficiency and equity in distribution of funds, the legislature should pursue consolidation of inefficient districts. No legislative action has ever been taken on this recommendation. (Hooker, Moak, PX 239)

Janes .

- 14. If one takes into account district lines no one could argue that the system was financially efficient and of district organizational lines were reorganized financial efficiency of the system could be greatly increased. (Moak, PX 239)
- 15. By taxing from larger areas of the state, the state could create and use for taxing purposes areas of similar property values for students. This would greatly reduce the existing large variations in expenditures per pupil, tax rates, inefficiency of many small districts and loss to budget-balance of other very wealthy districts. (Hooker, Moak, Ward)

D. <u>Legal Conclusion</u>

The system of public school finance in Texas is not an efficient system and violates the Legislature's duty required by Art. 7, \$1 of the Texas Constitution.

ATTORNEYS FEES CLAIMS

A. Legal Standards

- 1. In proceedings under the Uniform Declaratory Judgment Act, TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE §37.001, et seq., the Court may award costs and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees.
- 2. In actions under TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE \$106.001, the Court may award the prevailing party reasonable attorneys fees as part of its costs.

B. Requirements In View of the Law

If Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors are prevailing parties in this litigation, they are entitled to reasonable attorneys fees and costs against Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors. However, these attorneys fees can be barred by sovereign immunity or denied under the Court's discretion.

C. Facts Supporting Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors Claims For Attorneys Fees

- 1. Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors are prevailing parties in this litigation.
 - 2. This is a case of supreme public importance.
- 3. Defendant-Intervenors have adopted the State's position in this litigation.
- 4. The reasonable and prevailing hourly rate for Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors attorneys Albert Kauffman, Richard

Gray, David Richards, Peter Roos and Roger Rice is \$150 per hour. The reasonable rate for the other attorneys is the litigation in \$120 per hour. Out of the "computable Mours" mantioned hereafter are found for the reasonable and numbers.

5. Albert Kauffman expended 2,607.4 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$391,110.00.

- 6. Richard Gray expended 729.1 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$109,365.00.
- 7. David Richards expended 484.8 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$72,720.00.
- 8. Peter Roos expended 333.8 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$50,070.00.
- 9. Roger Rice expended 508.4 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$76,260.00.
- 10. Norma Cantu expended 520.7 compensable hours in this a sure Malle is litigation for which she is entitled to a fee of \$62,484.00.
- 11. Camilo Perez expended 436 compensable hours in this a statement to a fee of \$52,320.00.
- 12. Renita Browning expended 271.1 compensable hours in a classical this litigation for which she is entitled to a fee of \$20.925.50.
- 13. Steve Martin expended 513.3 compensable hours in this a scattefull in this litigation for which he is antitled to a fee of \$61,596.00.
- 14. Jose Garza expended 45 compensable hours in this a walker with the sentitled to a fee of \$5,400.00.
- 15. Jose Roberto Juarez expended 60.5 compensable hours in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$7,260.00.
- 16. Ken Shepherdson expended 12.85 compensable hours in a summer with this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$1,542.00.

confine !le hour

17. Phil Durst expended 13.0 hours, it this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$1,560.00.

18. Mitch Green expended 27.5 house in this litigation for which he is entitled to a fee of \$3,300.00.

- 19. A reasonable rate for paralegal costs in this litigation is \$25 per hour. MALDEF expended 4,333.50 of number compensable paralegal time on this litigation for which it is entitled to a fee of \$108,337.50.
- 20. Richard Gray's law firm expended 315.1 hours of MUNICA Paralegal law clerk time for which it is entitled to a fee of it (\$7,877.50.
- 21. MALDEF A is entitled to reinbursement for expenses (exclusive of Court costs) of \$62,760.96.
- 22. Attorney Gray As entitled to reimbursement for expenses (exclusive of Court costs) of \$26,284.34.
- 23. Attorney Rice As entitled to reimburgement for expenses (exclusive of Court costs) of \$13,642.00.
- 24. Attorney Browning dis entitled to roimbursement for () expenses (exclusive of Court costs) of \$390.83.

D. Legal Conclusions

- 1. An award of attorneys fees to Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors against both the Defendants and the Defendant-Intervenors is berred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity.
- 2. In addition, the Court holds that an award of attorneys fees against Defendant-Intervenors would be neither equitable nor

just under the terms of the Declaratory Judgment Act, TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. Code §37.009, and that even if Plaintiffs had prevailed under TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. Code §\$106.001-003, the Court would decline to exercise its discretion to award fees against Defendant-Intervenors under TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. Code §106.002.

3. Were it not for the doctrine of sovereign immunity the Court would enter Judgement against Defendants for Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors' attorneys fees and costs.

VI. REMEDY

A. <u>Declaratory Judgment</u>

Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors are entitled to a Declaratory Judgment that the Texas School Financing System (Texas Education Code §§16.01, et seq., implemented in conjunction with school district boundaries that contain unequal taxable property wealth for the financing of public education) violates the Texas Constitution, Art. 1 §3 and Art. 7 §1; as provided for in Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem.. Code §§37.001 et seq.

B. Injunctive Relief

1. Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors will suffer irreparable harm if Defendants are not enjoined from continuing to enforce the present Texas School Financing System (Texas Education Code §16.01 et seq., implemented in conjunction with local school district boundaries that contain unequal taxable property wealth for the financing of public education).

- 2. Plaintiff and Plaintiff-Intervenors have an inadequate remedy at law, making injunctive relief appropriate.
- 3. The Court has balanced the equities, considering the importance of education and the constitutional rights protected by this Court's Judgment and the interests of Defendants and finds that the balance of equities favors the granting and staying of injunctive relief as ordered by the Court in its June 1, 1987 Judgment.
- 4. The school children of Texas who do not receive an equal access to educational funds are irreparably harmed because the school districts in which they reside do not constitutionally guaranteed choice or ability to educational services and programs available to students of wealthier districts. The denial of equal educational opportunities under the present system results in a harm to school chilren that would be extremely difficult to calculate and allocate under the traditional law of money damages. Alternatives to an injunction could result in a multiplicity of lawsuits and unacceptable delay, all to the permanent and irreparable detriment of the educational advancement of hundreds of thousands of school children in Texas.
- 5. The Court orders an injunction under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Remedies Code §65.001 et seq., Tex. Gov. Code §24.011 and the general equity powers of the Court, as expressed in this Court's June 1, 1987 Judgment.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Texas system of public school financing violates the Texas Constitution, Art. 1 §3, Art. 1 §3a, and Art. 7 §1. Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief.

FILED AND ENTERED this.

JUDGE HARLEY CHARK 250TH DISTRICT COURT TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

MISCEL-LANEOUS

C 8353

NO. C-8353

IN SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

FEB 15 1989

IN THE

MAKY M. WAKEFIELD, Clerk SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

Deputy

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.,

Petitioners

ν.

WILLIAM KIRBY, ET AL.,

Respondents

RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSE TO APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR


TO THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS:

Come now the Andrews Independent School District, et al., the Eanes Independent School District, et al., the Irving Independent School District, et al., and William Kirby, et al., Respondents herein and file this their Application for Extension of Time in Which to File Response to Application for Writ of Error, for which they would respectfully show the Court as follows:

RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, PAGE 1

CORRECTION

This Document
Has Been Rephotographed
To Assure Legibility.



C 8353

MO_{\bullet} Characteristic	NO.	C-	8	3	5	3
-------------------------------	-----	----	---	---	---	---

FILED IN SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

FEB 15 1989

IN THE

MAKY M. WAKEFIELD, Clerk SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

Sy _____Deputy

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.,

Petitioners

V.

WILLIAM RIRBY, ET AL.,

Respondents

RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSE TO APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS:

Come now the Andrews Independent School District, et al., the Early Independent School District, et al., the Irving Independent School District, et al., and William Kirby, et al., Respondents herein and file this their Application for Extension of Time in Which to File Response to Application for Writ of Error, for which they would respectfully show the Court as follows:

RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, PAGE 1

On February 10, 1989, Applications for Writ of Error were docketed with this Court in the above styled and numbered cause. Petitioners, Alvarado Independent School District, et al., filed a fifty-page Application for Writ of Error and Petitioners Edgewood Independent School District, et al., have filed a seventy-page Application for Writ of Error in this Court. Pursuant to the provisions of Rule 136 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, Respondents' Brief is due to be filed on the 25th day of February, 1989, which is a Saturday, thereby making the Brief due in this Court on February 27, 1989. Due to the complexity of the issues and the extensiveness of the record, Respondents herein would respectfully request the Court for an extension of time in which to file their response to the Application for Writ of Error to and including the 17th day of March, 1989. This request for extension is not made for the purposes of delay, but rather, so that justice may be done and the issues raised by the two applications for writ of error can be fully developed for this Court without the necessity of any motions to file briefs in excess of fifty pages.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Petitioners respectfully request this Court to grant this Motion for an Extension of Time in which to File their Response to the Petitioners Application for Writ of Error to and including the 17th day of March, 1989

and for such other relief to which they may show themselves justly entitled to receive.

LAW OFFICES OF EARL LUNA, P.C. Earl Luna (Bar #12690000)
Robert E. Luna (Bar #12693000)
Mary Milford (Bar #14051000)
4411 Central Building
4411 N. Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205

Attorneys for Appellants Andrews Independent School District, et al.

James W. Deatherage Power, Deatherage, Tharp & Blankenship 1311 W. Irving Blvd. Irving, Texas 75063

John F. Boyle, Jr.
Kenneth C. Dippel
Robert F. Brown (Bar #13164725)
Hutchison, Price, Boyle & Brooks
3900 First City Center
Dallas, Texas 75201-4622

Attorneys for Respondent Irving Independent School District, et al.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Turner (Bar #20318500)
P. O. Box 780
Crockett, Texas 75835

Attorney for Respondents Eanes Independent School District, et al.

Kevin P. O'Hanlon Assistant Attorney General P. O. Box 12548 Capital Station Austin, Texas 78711-2548

Attorney for Respondent William N. Kirby, et al.

By: // Mary Milford Bar #14051000

RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, PAGE 3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Application for Extension of Time in Which to File Response to Application for Writ of Error has on this date been mailed via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to the counsel of record as shown below, on this the 14th day of February, 1989.

Mary Wilford

Mr. Richard E. Gray III Gray & Becker 807 Brazos, Suite 901 Austin, TX 78701 Mr. David R. Richards Richards & Durst 600 W. 7th Street Austin, TX 78701

Mr. Albert H. Kaufman
Mexican-American Legal
Defense & Educational Fund
314 E. Commerce St., Suite 200
San Antonio, TX 78205

"app/ex-edgewood"
(MM1)

IN SUPPLEME COURT OF TEXAS

C 8353

FEB 20 1989

NO. C-8353

MARY M. WAKEFIELD, Clerk

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,
Petitioners/Plaintiffs,

٧.

WILLIAM KIRBY, et al.,

Respondents/Defendants, Defendant-Intervenors.

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO RESPONDENTS' APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSE TO APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS:

Come now Edgewood Independent School District, et al., Petitioners, who file this response in opposition to the Respondents' application for extension of time in which to file response to application for writ of error. Petitioners request that this Court require the Respondents briefs to be filed no later than February 27, 1989. In support of this response, Petitioners would show as follows:

- 1. That Petitioners' application for Writ of Error was hand delivered to State Defendant's Attorney on February 3, 1989 and was received by each of the other defense attorneys on February 6, 1989.
- 2. That the February 27, 1989 date will give the Respondents 24 or 21 days to respond.
- 3. Though the issues in this case are important and complex, the issues in the case have been thoroughly and exhaustively briefed (approximately 300 pages) before the Court of Appeals and very little additional briefing is necessary for the filing of Respondents' briefs in the case. Indeed the Petitioners' briefs cover the same arguments as those before the Court of Appeals and a few additional arguments.
- 4. This request for a delay by the Defendants comes at an especially important time in terms of this Court's session and in term of the Legislative session. Petitioners' consistent efforts to get this issue before the Supreme Court at the earliest possible date will be thwarted by granting a delay in this case.
- 5. This is a case of supreme public importance. Both the court system and the legislative decision are watching this case with great interest. However most important the children of poor wealth districts in Texas must attend poor wealth districts one additional year beginning in August 1989. Their chances for equal opportunity will only be realized if this Court and the Legislature deal with this problem as soon as possible. Further delay denies the rights of the 1,000,000 children in low wealth school districts in Texas.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Petitioners pray:

- (1) that Respondents request for extension of time be denied;
- (2) that Respondents' briefs be due no later than February 27, 1989; and
 - (3) that this case be expedited as much as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

ROGER RICE

CAMILO PEREZ PETER ROOS

ANTONIA HERNANDEZ
NORMA V. CANTU
JOSE GARZA
JUDITH A. SANDERS-CASTRO
ALBERT H. KAUFFMAN
Mexican American Legal Defense
and Educational Fund
140 E. Houston Street
The Book Building, Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
(512)224-5476

ĀΊ

META, INC. 50 Broadway Somerville, MA 02144 (617)628-2226

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONERS EDGEWOOD ISD, ET AL.

DAVID HALL TEXAS RURAL LEGAL AID, INC. 259 S. Texas Weslaco, TX 78596

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I have sent by certified mail return receipt requested by U.S. mail copies of Petitioners' Response to Respondents' Application for Extension of Time in Which to File to Response To Application for Writ of Error on this 17th day of February, 1989, to all counsel of record.

Mr. John F. Boyle, Jr. Mr. Kenneth C. Dippel Mr. Robert F. Brown Hutchison, Price, Boyle & Brooks 3900 First City Center Dallas, Texas 75201-4622

Mr. Camilo Perez-Bustillo Mr. Roger Rice META, Inc. 50 Broadway Somerville, MA 02144

Mr. Richard E. Gray, III Gray & Becker 323 Congress Ave., Ste. 300 Austin, TX 78701

Mr. Robert E. Luna Law Offices of Earl Luna, P.C. 4411 Central Bldg. 4411 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75205

Mr. James W. Deatherage Power, Deatherage, Tharp & Blankenship 1311 W. Irvin Blvd. Irving, TX 75063-7220

Hon. Jim Mattox Attorney General Supreme Court Building Austin, TX 78711-2548

Mr. Kevin T. O'Hanlon Assistant Attorney General P. O. Box 12548 Capitol Station Austin, TX 78711

Mr. David Hall Texas Rural Legal Aid, Inc. 259 S. Texas Weslaco, TX 78701

Mr. Timothy L. Hall Mr. Jim Turner Hughes & Luce 400 W. 15th Suite 1500 Austin, TX 78701

Mr. Jerry Hoodenpyle Rohne, Hoodenpyle, Lobert & Myers P. O. Box 13010 76013 Arlington, TX

ALBERT H. KAUFFMAN

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONERS

EDGEWOOD, ET AL.

THE CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY

NSUFAERE COURT

C 8353

Xe. C-8353

interior

MARY M. WAKEHELD, CIER

TH THE

Deputy

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

Petitioners

V.

WILLIAM N. KIRBY, et al.,

Respondents

BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS AND
PETITIONER-INTERVENORS APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR
FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS, AND
WILLIAM N. KIRBY, TEXAS COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, TEXAS
STATE FOARD OF EDUCATION, HON. WILLIAM CLEMENTS, GOVERNOR OF
TEXAS, HON. ROBERT BULLOCK, COMPTROLLER OF TEXAS, HON. JIM

Respectfully submitted,

JIM MATTOX Attorney General of Texas

MARY F. KELLER First Assistant Attorney General

LCU McCREARY Executive Assistant Attorney General

JAMES C. TODD, Chief General Litigation Division

JOHN DAVID THOMESON, 111 General Counsel Texas Education Agency

MATTOX, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAB

KEVIN O'HANLON
Assistant Attorney General
State Bar No. 15235500
General Litigation Division
P.O. Box 12548
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 463-2120

ACTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENTS

No. C-8353

* * * * * * * *

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS

* * * * * * * *

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

Petitioners

٧.

WILLIAM N. KIRBY, et al.,

Respondents

.

BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' AND
PETITIONER-INTERVENORS' APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF ERROR
FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS, AND
WILLIAM N. KIRBY, TEXAS COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, TEXAS
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, HON. WILLIAM CLEMENTS, GOVERNOR OF
TEXAS, HON. ROBERT BULLOCK, COMPTROLLER OF TEXAS, HON. JIM
MATTOX, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

Respectfully submitted,

JIM MATTOX Attorney General of Texas

MARY F. KELLER First Assistant Attorney General

LOU McCREARY Executive Assistant Attorney General

JAMES C. TODD, Chief General Litigation Division

JOHN DAVID THOMPSON, III General Counsel Texas Education Agency KEVIN O'HANLON
Assistant Attorney General
State Bar No. 15235500
General Litigation Division
P.O. Box 12548
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 463-2120

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENTS

LIST OF PARTIES

In order that the members of the court may determine disqualification or recusal pursuant to the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 131(a), Respondent certifies that the following is a complete list of all parties to this case:

PLAINTIFFS AND APPELLEES BELOW, PETITIONERS HEREIN

SOCORRO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
EAGLE PASS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
BROWNSVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SAN ELIZARIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
LA VEGA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
KENEDY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
MILANO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
HARLANDALE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
NORTH FOREST INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

ANICETO ALONZO, on his own behalf and as next friend of SANTOS ALONZO, HERMELINDA ALONZO and JESUS ALONZO

SHIRLEY ANDERSON, on her own behalf and as next friend of DERRICK PRICE

JUANITA ARREDONDO, on her own behalf and as next friend of AUGUSTIN ARREDONDO, JR., NORA ARREDONDO and SYLVIA ARREDONDO MARY CANTU, on her own behalf and as next friend of JOSE CANTU,

JESUS CANTU and TONATIUH CANTU

EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

JOSEFINA CASTILLO, on her own behalf and as next friend of MARIA CORENO

EVA W. DELGADO, on her own behalf and as next friend of OMAR DELGADO

RAMONA DIAZ, on her own behalf and as next friend of MANUEL DIAZ and NORMA DIAZ

ANITA GANDARA, JOSE GANDARA, JR., on their own behalves and as next friend of LORRAINE GANDARA and JOSE GANDARA, III

NICOLAS GARCIA, on his own behalf and as next friend of NICOLAS GARCIA, JR., RODOLFO GARCIA, ROLANDO GARCIA, GRACIELA GARCIA, CRISELDA GARCIA, and RIGOBERTO GARCIA

RAQUEL GARCIA, on her own behalf and as next friend of FRANK GARCIA, JR., ROBERTO GARCIA, RICARDO GARCIA, ROXANNE GARCIA and RENE GARCIA

HERMELINDA C. GONZALEZ, on her own behalf and as next friend of ANGELICA MARIA GONZALEZ

RICARDO J. MOLINA, on his own behalf and as next friend of JOB FERNANDO MOLINA

OPAL MAYO, on her own behalf and as next friend of JOHN MAYO, SCOTT MAYO and REBECCA MAYO

HILDA S. ORTIZ, on her own behalf and as next friend of JUAN GABRIEL ORTIZ

- RUDY C. ORTIZ, on his own behalf and as next friend of MICHELLE ORTIZ, ERIC ORTIZ and ELIZABETH ORTIZ
- ESTELA PADILLA and CARLOS PADILLA, on their own behalves and as next friend of GABRIEL PADILLA
- ADOLFO PATINO, on his own behalf and as next friend of ADOLFO PATINO, JR.
- ANTONIO Y. PINA, on his own behalf and as next friend of ANTONIO PINA, JR., ALMA MIA PINA and ANA PINA
- REYMUNDO PEREZ, on his own behalf and as next friend of RUBEN PEREZ, REYMUNDO PEREZ, JR., MONICA PEREZ, RAQUEL PEREZ, ROGELIO PEREZ and RICARDO PEREZ
- DEMETRIO RODRIGUEZ, on his own behalf and as next friend of PATRICIA RODRIGUEZ and JAMES RODRIGUEZ
- LORENZO G. SOLIS, on his own behalf and as next friend of JAVIER SOLIS and CYNTHIA SOLIS
- JOSE A. VILLALON, on his own behalf and as next friend of RUBEN VILLALON, RENE VILLALON, MARIA CHRISTINA VILLALON and JAIME VILLALON

PLAINTIFF-INTERVENORS AND APPELLEES BELOW, PETITIONERS HEREIN

ALVARADO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT BLANKET INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT BURLESON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT CANUTILLO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT CHILTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT COPPERAS COVE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT COVINGTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT CRAWFORD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT CRYSTAL CITY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT EARLY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT EDCOUCH-ELSA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT EVANT INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT FABENS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT FARWELL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT GODLEY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT GOLDTHWAITE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT GRANDVIEW INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT HICO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT JIM HOGG COUNTY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT HUTTO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT JARRELL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRIC JONESBORO INDEPENDENT CHOOL DISTRICT KARNES CITY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LA FERIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LA JOYA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LAMPASAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LASARA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LOCKHART INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LOS FRESNOS CONSOLIDATED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LYFORD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT LYTLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

MART INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT MERCEDES INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT MERIDIAN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT MISSION INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NAVASOTA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ODEM-EDROY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT PALMER INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT PRINCETON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRESSO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT RIO GRANDE CITY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ROMA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ROSEBUD-LOTT INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SAN ANTONIC INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SAN SABA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SANTA MARIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SANTA ROSA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SHALLOWATER INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SOUTHSIDE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT STAR INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT STOCKDALE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT TRENTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT VENUS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT WEATHERFORD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT YSLETA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT CONNIE DEMARSE H. B. HALBERT LIBBY LANCASTER JUDY ROBINSON FRANCES RODRIGUEZ ALICE SALAS

DEFENDANTS AND APPELLANTS BELOW, RESPONDENTS HEREIN

WILLIAM N. KIRBY, INTERIM TEXAS COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MARK WHITE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS ROBERT BULLOCK, COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF TEXAS THE STATE OF TEXAS JIM MATTOX, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS AND APPELLANTS BELOW, RESPONDENTS HEREIN

ANDREWS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARLINGTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
AUSTWELL TIVOLI INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
BECKVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
CARTHAGE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
CLEBURNE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
COPPELL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
CROWLEY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
DESOTO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT